

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Michael Hitter, # 071198,	)	C.A. No. 2:06-0204-TLW-RSC
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
SCDC Warden George Hagan;	)	
S.C. Dept. of Corrections; and	)	
S.C. Dept. of Probation, Parole, and Pardon,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

The *pro se* petitioner, an inmate at the South Carolina Department of Corrections, seeks *habeas corpus* relief under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2254. (Doc. # 1). This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). (Doc. # 7). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Carr Rogers recommends that the above-captioned case be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file a return. Petitioner has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 8).

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and

Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 7), petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 8); and the above-captioned case is dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file a return.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRY L. WOOTEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

April 6, 2006  
Florence, South Carolina

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that petitioner filed a Motion to Appoint Counsel (Doc. # 9) and a Motion to Reassign Case to another Magistrate Judge (Doc. # 10) at the same time that he filed his objections to the Report. After careful review and in light of this Court's acceptance of the Report in this case, the Court denies these motions.